

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,537	LIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roy M. Punnoose	2886	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) Roy M. Punnoose.

(3) _____.

 (2) Atty. Cheng-Kang Hsu (Reg. No. L0234).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 March 2007
Time: 1:00 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None.

Claims discussed:

Claim 9

Prior art documents discussed:


None.

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Atty. Cheng-Kang Hsu stated that in claim 9, "producing" was equivalent to outputting of the comparison results. In light of the clarification, Atty. Hsu agreed to an Examiner's amendment to replace "producing" with "outputting" in the last line of claim 9.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)